

ENTERED

February 27, 2024

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

PATRICIA DODD,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff.	§	
	§	
V.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:21-CV-02216
	§	
ROBERT GLASER, <i>et al.</i> ,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION**

On January 3, 2024, this case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Andrew M. Edison under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Dkt. 123. Judge Edison filed a Memorandum and Recommendation on January 16, 2024, recommending that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 93) be **GRANTED**. Dkt. 128.

On January 30, 2024, Plaintiff filed her Objections. Dkt. 129. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the [magistrate judge's] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection [has been] made." After conducting this de novo review, the Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." *Id.*; *see also* FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3).


The Court has carefully considered the Objections; the Memorandum and Recommendation; the pleadings; and the record. The Court **ACCEPTS** Judge Edison's

Memorandum and Recommendation and **ADOPTS** it as the opinion of the Court. It is therefore **ORDERED** that:

- (1) Judge Edison's Memorandum and Recommendation (Dkt. 128) is **APPROVED AND ADOPTED** in its entirety as the holding of the Court; and
- (2) Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 93) is **GRANTED**; and
- (3) This case is **DISMISSED**.

It is so **ORDERED**.

SIGNED and ENTERED this 26th day of February 2024.



GEORGE C. HANKS, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE